



1646

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0032

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2003 <small>Patent fees are subject to annual revision.</small>		Complete if Known	
		Application Number	09/911,346-Conf. #4955
		Filing Date	July 24, 2001
		First Named Inventor	Jian Ni
		Examiner Name	P. Mertz
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27	Group Art Unit	1646	
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$)		0.00	Attorney Docket No. PF199D2

RECEIVED

DEC 20 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)		FEE CALCULATION (continued)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Check	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit Card	3. ADDITIONAL FEES			
<input type="checkbox"/> Money Order	<input type="checkbox"/> Other				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deposit Account					
Deposit Account Number	08-3425				
Deposit Account Name	Human Genome Sciences, Inc.				
The Commissioner is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Charge fee(s) indicated below	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit any overpayments				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application					
<input type="checkbox"/> Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee					
to the above-identified deposit account.					
FEE CALCULATION					
1. BASIC FILING FEE					
Large Entity	Small Entity				
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1001	740	2001	370	Utility filing fee	
1002	330	2002	165	Design filing fee	
1003	510	2003	255	Plant filing fee	
1004	740	2004	370	Reissue filing fee	
1005	160	2005	80	Provisional filing fee	
SUBTOTAL (1)		(\$)		0.00	
2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE					
Total Claims	-20** =	Extra Claims	Fee from below	Fee Paid	
Independent Claims	-3** =				
Multiple Dependent					
Large Entity	Small Entity				
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20	
1201	84	2201	42	Independent claims in excess of 3	
1203	280	2203	140	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid	
1204	84	2204	42	** Reissue independent claims over original patent	
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent	
SUBTOTAL (2)		(\$)		0.00	
**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above					
Other fee (specify)					
*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid					
SUBTOTAL (3)		(\$)		0.00	

SUBMITTED BY		Complete (if applicable)	
Name (Print/Type)	Lin J. Hymel	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	45,414
Signature		Telephone	(301) 251-6015
		Date	December 18, 2002



VIA HAND DELIVERY DECEMBER 18, 2002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Ni et al.

Docket No.: PF199D2

Application No.: 09/911,346

Group Art Unit: 1646

Filed: July 24, 2001

Examiner: P. Mertz

For: Natural Killer Cell Enhancing Factor C

RECEIVED
DEC 20 2002
TECH CENTER 1600/2900
#7
A.9.3
1/15/03

PROVISIONAL ELECTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.143
WITH TRAVERSE

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated November 18, 2002, please consider the following provisional election with traverse. Applicants submit concurrently herewith: (a) a Fee Transmittal Sheet; (b) Marked-Up Copy of the Specification.

Provisional Election With Traverse

The Examiner has separated the pending claims into three different groups and has required an election under 35 U.S.C. § 121. *See*, Paper No. 6, page 2-3.

In order to be fully responsive, Applicants hereby provisionally elect, *with traverse*, the claims currently restricted to Group I (*i.e.*, claims 1-20, 29-52, 61-83, 92-115, and 124-127 drawn to antibodies).

With respect to separation of the claimed invention into three (3) groups and the reasons stated therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse. It was asserted in the restriction requirement that Groups I, II, and III claims represent distinct inventions because "the antibody of invention I as claimed can be used in the process of immunochromatography, to purify the NKEF C protein." *See*, Paper No. 6, page 2. It was then concluded:

Having shown that these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications and recognized divergent subject matter as

defined by MPEP.. § 808.02, the Examiner has *prima facie* shown a serious burden of search (see MPEP..§ 803).”

Id. at 2-3.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that it would not entail a serious burden to examine all pending claims together, because a search of the antibody claims can be expected to provide all necessary information for the method of detecting and method of treatment claims. In particular, any publication that describes use of the claimed antibody in a method of detection or treatment must necessarily describe the antibody that is used therein. Therefore, any publications that might potentially disclose the presently claimed antibody would also encompass all publications disclosing methods of using that antibody (whether it be for detection or treatment purposes).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C § 121 be reconsidered and withdrawn and the instant claims be examined in one application.

Request for Rejoinder of Product and Method of use Claims:

Furthermore, if the restriction requirement is maintained, Applicants request rejoinder of the claims of Groups I, II and III once the claims of Group I are found allowable. In light of the decisions in *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ2d 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995) and *In re Brouwer*, 77 F.3d 422, 37 USPQ 2d 1663 (Fed. Cir. 1996), a notice was published in the Official Gazette which set forth new guidelines for the treatment of product and process claims. *See* 1184 OG 86 (March 26, 1996). Specifically, the notice states that:

in the case of an elected product claim, rejoinder will be permitted when a product claim is found allowable and the withdrawn process claim depends from or otherwise includes all the limitations of an allowed product claim.

Id. Accordingly, if claims of Group I are found allowable, Applicants respectfully request that the claims of Groups II and III be rejoined and examined for patentability. *See* also M.P.E.P. § 821.04. Applicants retain the right to petition from the restriction requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.144.